

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are all of the claims pending in the application

I. Objections to the Claims

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that claims 8-14 are improper multiple dependent claims (see Office Action at page 2).

Applicants note that a multiple dependent claim is a dependent claim which refers back in the alternative to more than one preceding independent or dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). In this regard, Applicants point out that each of claims 8-14 is clearly drafted such that it refers to a single preceding claim. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-14 are not multiple dependent claims, and therefore, clearly cannot be considered improper multiple dependent claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants kindly request that the objection to the claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Park (U.S. 6,933,990). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the following basis.

Claim 1 recites the features of a circuit board having a driving circuit mounted thereon for lighting a display panel; and a conductive chassis functioning as a ground potential of the driving circuit, wherein the circuit board is fixed to the conductive chassis via a conductive member. Applicants respectfully submit that Park does not disclose or suggest such a combination of features.

Regarding Park, Applicants note that this reference discloses a liquid crystal display (LCD) device that is provided with a heat shielding film in order to prevent the degeneration of the display due to heat generated therein (see Abstract). The LCD device of Park includes control modules 230, 240, 250, 260 for controlling an LCD panel 225, and a backlight assembly 300 for generating the light which is supplied to the LCD panel 225 (see Fig. 2; col. 4, lines 42-51; and col. 5, lines 55-59).

As shown in Fig. 3A of Park, the backlight assembly 300 includes an inverter module 380, a heat shielding film 400 and a receiving container 370, wherein the heat shielding film 400 is disposed between the inverter module 380 and the receiving container 370 (see col. 6, lines 46-48).

In the Office Action at page 2, the Examiner has taken the position that the control modules 230, 250 of Park correspond to the “circuit board” of claim 1. In addition, it appears as though the Examiner is asserting that the inverter module 380 of Park corresponds to the “driving circuit” of claim 1, and that the heat shielding film 400 (or element 480 in Fig. 12) of Park corresponds to the “conductive chassis” of claim 1.

As noted above, claim 1 recites that the circuit board is fixed to the conductive chassis via a conductive member. Based on the above-noted description of Park, as well as the Examiner’s above-noted correspondence between Park and the elements in claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Park does not disclose such a feature because the control modules 230, 250 of Park are clearly not fixed to the heat shielding film 400 (or 480) via a conductive member (see Fig. 3A).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Park does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the feature of a circuit board that is fixed to the conductive chassis via a conductive member, as recited in claim 1.

Further, Applicants note that claim 1 also recites that a soft metal is disposed at a joint section between the conductive chassis and the conductive member. As described above, Park does not disclose a circuit board that is fixed to a conductive chassis via a conductive member.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Park clearly does not disclose or suggest that a soft metal is disposed at a joint section between a conductive chassis and a conductive member. In this regard, Applicants note that the Examiner has not addressed this claim limitation in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Park, an indication of which is kindly requested.

If the Examiner maintains the rejection based on Park, Applicants kindly request that the Examiner explicitly identify the elements in Park that are being relied upon as allegedly corresponding to each of the features recited in claim 1.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has indicated that claims 2-7 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Tsuneo IKURA et al.

By Kenneth W. Fields
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No.52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/jjv
Washington, D.C.
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 25, 2007